

## REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claims 1 – 3 and 10 – 21 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,648,044 to Hardy *et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,598,036 to Wang *et al.* In that regard, the Examiner stated that Hardy *et al.* discloses:

“then receiving a rule by the computer, the rule defining a premise and a conclusion to be drawn from the premise (col. 10, lines 12 – 20);  
then generating a subroutine by the server that determines if the premise is true and, based at least in part upon the conclusion, outputting a first value if the premise is true and outputting a second value if the premise is false. (col. 11, lines 40 – 67).”

In addition, the Examiner stated that Wang *et al.* discloses:

“displaying a field for receiving a rule on a computer (col. 3, lines 29 – 41);  
then transmitting the rule from the computer to a server (col. 3, lines 42 – 52);  
then storing the rule on the server (col. 3, lines 7 – 14);”

Applicants have amended claim 1, the only remaining independent claim, to more clearly point out the claimed invention. Claim 1 now requires a client computer to display a field for receiving a rule that is to be input into the client computer by a user of the client computer. In addition, claim 1 requires the client computer to receive a rule that was input into the client computer by the user of the client computer.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Hardy *et al.* nor Wang *et al.* disclose a client computer displaying a field on the client computer for receiving a rule that is to be input into the client computer by a user of the client computer. Similarly, neither Hardy *et al.* nor Wang *et al.* disclose a client computer receiving a rule that was input into the client computer by the user of the client computer.

Applicants also respectfully submit that neither Hardy *et al.* nor Wang *et al.* disclose generating a function that determines if the premise of claim 1 is true. The premise that is referenced in the “generating a function” limitation of claim 1 is a very specific premise. Recall that claim 1 requires:

“receiving by the client computer a rule that was input into the client computer by the user of the client computer, the rule defining a premise and a conclusion to be drawn if the premise is true” and

“then transmitting the rule from the client computer to a server.”

Thus, “generating a function by the server that determines if the premise is true” requires a server generating a function that determines if a premise, which was defined by a rule input into a client computer by a user of the client computer and then sent from the client computer to the server, is true. In order for such a generation to occur, the function must be generated after the rule was sent from the client computer to the server. Simply executing a pre-existing function does not meet such a limitation. As a result, Hardy *et al.* does not disclose generating the claimed function.

**CONCLUSION**

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By Hoyt A. Fleming III  
Hoyt A. Fleming III  
Registration No. 41752

Date: February 24, 2006

<b>Address correspondence to:</b>  <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> <i>Customer Number or Bar Code Label</i>  <div style="text-align: center; font-size: 1.2em; font-weight: bold;">28422</div>	<b>or</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Correspondence Address Below</i>  Park, Vaughan & Fleming LLP P.O. Box 140678 Boise, ID 83714	<b>Direct telephone calls to:</b>  Hoyt A. Fleming III (208) 336-5237
---	--	--